



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

1787 would have instinctively eschewed all reference to the coercion of States by the force of arms, and concentrated their attention upon a method of international control under self-imposed laws interpreted by self-created tribunals. The next President of the United States should know what has been done.

The next President of the United States should be judicially minded. This is necessary if, under his leadership, we are to avoid the dangers that follow inevitably upon undiluted idealism, upon inconsistency and caprice. Knowing the facts, he should be able to base his judgment upon them; knowing the law, to give expression to it. It ought to appear necessary to him that he avoid convulsive movements and promise to the other nations nothing which America cannot consistently fulfill. He must avoid alliances for the enforcement of peace by arms as he would avoid a pestilence, for such have been the ways of all wars and their unmentionable miseries. Familiar with the age-long, if faltering climb of men toward the peaceable settlement of international disputes, that movement culminating in The Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907, he will recognize that movement, with all its inadequacies, as the supreme movement of the will of nations to establish peace between themselves and to attain unto it through that justice which is attainable only under law. With the judicial mind and temper to appreciate that, he will, therefore, aim to complete the machinery already under way for dealing with arbitral disputes and to realize those plans universally agreed upon in 1907 to perfect plans for periodic conferences of all the nations and for the establishment of an international court of justice. Thus, his judicial mind will lead him to do his share to correct the mistake of the Paris negotiators. He will know that the peace of the world cannot be promoted by American abnegation of her essential sovereignty or greatness, by transferring her right of self-determination over to a group of foreign diplomats and politicians unrestrained by any law or any court. He will know this to be true of America—free, sovereign, and independent. He will know it to be true, also, for all of the nations—free, sovereign, and independent as well. His visions for the society of nations will show him the necessity first for a virile nationalism. He will commit the United States to no guarantee of impalpable boundaries or impalpable anything else. Being judicially minded, he will not deign to distinguish between moral and legal obligations, national or international. He will work with the legislative branch of our government for the accomplishment of achievable results. Because of his judicial mind, he will go about these things in these ways, for of such is the kingdom of peace.

The next President of the United States should have an international mind. Since our foreign policy is now

of greater importance than ever before, and is destined through the coming decade to increase in significance, it is vitally demanded by the interests of America and of the world that there shall be at the executive head of this nation a man unwilling to leave the fortunes of this or of our sister nations to chance and mere hazard. Such a man must, therefore, know nations other than this—their various resources, their governments, their treaty obligations, their aspirations and temperaments. He must have an intelligent grasp of international causes and effects. He must have eyes that have seen the world's past, a mind that can behold the world's present, and a soul that reaches over the world that spreads before. Memory, intelligence, honor, and foresight must be his, and these enlarged to include an East that is West and a West that is East in the deep things of the human spirit.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE PEACE OF THE WORLD

THE Republican plank on the League of Nations is wordy, paraphrastic, and repetitious; but in its affirmative statements it is, from our point of view, eminently sound and altogether satisfactory. It affirms:

1. That there should be a Society of Nations—"International Association"—growing out of an "agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world."

2. That such a Society of Nations should "provide methods" for the maintenance of "the rule of public right."

3. That this should be accomplished "by development of law and the decisions of impartial courts."

4. That means should be provided for a "general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action"; that is to say, that there should be a council of conciliation to consider, to discuss and to report upon such actions of non-justiciable character as may be submitted by an agreement of the powers.

5. That the right of self-determination shall be retained by the American people in all questions involving the possibilities of war.

6. That the covenant of the League of Nations, based upon "expediency and negotiation" and ignoring the American sentiment for the principles of "international law and arbitration," is a signal failure.

7. That President Wilson's dictatorial behavior toward the Senate in the premises has been indefensible.

8. That the United States Senate has simply performed its honorable duty.

The constructive aspects of this program are so consonant with the principles and methods set forth on the

inside of the front cover of the *Advocate of Peace* that the members of the American Peace Society could but accept them in all their fullness. We respectfully suggest that now the Democratic Party adopt the same program and make it unanimous.

THE INEVITABILITY OF WAR

WAR is thought by many to be the inevitable fate of man. It is openly agreed now in a number of quarters that when we were told that this war was a "war to end war" that we were lied to. The "war for peace," Lloyd-George's "never again," were mere catch phrases. The from twenty to thirty wars now going on simply corroborate the belief that war is inevitable. We must keep fit and ready for the big wars now on the way. Our military, air, and naval supremacy are being challenged in various places of the world. Such are the views held and expressed by the Field Marshal of Great Britain, Chief of Staff, Sir Henry Wilson, views which he candidly expressed at the annual meeting of the Union Jack Club, London, May 19. From conversations with army officers in this country, we have no doubt that the British Chief of Staff has simply expressed the views of the American army officers. Marshal Foch has recently expressed his belief in the inevitability of war. The inevitability of war is the cardinal principle of the warrior class and of other people the world around.

It is not necessary to look far for further evidence that under conditions as they now are war is the inevitable fate of us all. The failure of the League of Nations to prevent or to stop the war between Poland and Russia; the many evidences that England, upon closer examination of the League of Nations, recants and turns to the position taken by the majority of the United States Senate; the condemnation of the League by the Republican Party in convention assembled, such facts have led persons of a certain type to despair and to conclude that war is inevitable now and forever more. Is it not true, they ask, that all animals make war; that therefore it is the natural thing in animal economy, including human animal economy? J. A. Thomson, thought by many to be the greatest living authority on heredity, once referred to the war of extermination waged by the brown rat against the black rat in Europe. Referring to this, a writer in Australia has recently remarked that man apparently prefers "the example of the rat to the teachings of Christ." But the point is that many men accept as a fact the inevitability of war.

But there are other facts. International organization is nearer of realization today than ever before. As pointed out elsewhere in these columns, the Republican

Party favors it and pledges itself to work for it. Of course, the Democratic Party will do the same. An association of nations—a society of nations, as we prefer to say—an agreement of the States forming such a society that no nation shall of right take a preponderating part in it, such a society is inevitable. In other words, a society of nations where no great or small powers shall contend and dominate because of their size merely, but where all together shall concern themselves with the welfare of the whole, that is the aspiration of thinking men everywhere.

Two American citizens are now in Europe doing their share to finish the great task all but completed at The Hague in 1907, the task of creating a judicial union of the nations to which all civilized nations and self-governing dominions shall be parties, a union pledging the good faith of the contracting parties to submit their justiciable disputes—that is to say, differences involving law or equity—to a permanent court of this union whose decisions will bind not only the litigating nations, but also all parties to its creation. The names of these men are Elihu Root and James Brown Scott. There are facts opposed to the argument that war is inevitable.

As for the proposition that all animals make war, the reply is that they do not. The well-known Thomson was mistaken about the rats. The Secretary of the London Zoölogical Society, Mr. Chaloner Mitchell, has recently shown that the common notion that one species of animals exterminates other species by means of fighting has no foundation in fact. Indeed, there is not now, neither has there been, any war between one species and another species of rat. There is no war among the lower animals. That some animals eat other animals for food is not to say that this is a part of the game of war. We would not say that man wages war upon cows and sheep for his beef and mutton. In the game of war—that is to say, in the game of organized killing of group by group—man stands alone. If war is inevitable, we must seek for its inevitability, not in the nature of the animal world outside man, but within the nature of man himself. Whether the nature of man is of such a texture that he must forever organize himself for a continuous warfare upon other members of the same species is for the present a matter of opinion. Our own opinion is that war is no more inevitable than is duelling, drunkenness, feud law of clans, or other tom-foolery.

We do believe that the existence of a warrior class in the various nations does tend to promote war. Evidently the framers of the United States Constitution felt the same way. In Article I of that most valuable instrument, the Congress made up of civilians is the body with authority to declare war, to grant letters of